UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/713,483	12/13/2012	Eric Kass	DE920110115US1	1517

30206   7590   12/08/2016
IBM CORPORATION
ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2495	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/08/2016	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rociplaw@us.ibm.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

Ex parte ERIC KASS

_____

Appeal 2016-003656
Application 13/713,483
Technology Center 2400

_____

Before JOSEPH L. DIXON, JOHN A. EVANS, and
CATHERINE SHIANG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SHIANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1–15, which are all the claims pending and rejected in the application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We reverse.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

According to the Specification, the present invention relates to data processing. *See generally* Spec. 1. Claim 1 is exemplary:

> 1. A computer-implemented method for secure web browsing, the method comprising:
> - receiving, by a proxy module, a request submitted from a browser, the browser running in a default runtime environment, the request requesting content provided by a remote server;

- determining, by the proxy module, whether at least one of the following is true: the received request requests insecure content, or the requested content comprises insecure content;
- in case the request is determined to request insecure content and/or in case the requested content is determined to comprise insecure content, sending, by the proxy module, a copy of the received request to a receiver module, the receiver module running in a secure runtime environment separate from the default runtime environment, the secure runtime environment preventing any malicious code executed in said runtime environment to affect the default runtime environment of the browser;
- responsive to sending, by the proxy module, a copy of the received request to the receiver module, receiving, from the receiver module, at least one of: a secure displayable version of a rendered form of the requested content, or a description enabling access to the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content, the rendered form of the requested content comprising a form produced in the secure runtime environment by a process of interpreting the requested content in a way that a graphical representation of the requested content can be displayed via a graphical user interface to a user, the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content comprising a secure displayable graphical representation of at least some insecure requested content; and
- forwarding, by the proxy module, at least one of the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content or the description enabling access to the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content received from the receiver module, to the browser.

References and Rejections

Claims 1–15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gribble (U.S. 2007/0174915 A1, published July 26, 2007).

ANALYSIS

Anticipation

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejection in light of Appellant's contentions and the evidence of record. We concur with Appellant's contention that the Examiner erred in finding Gribble discloses

> *receiving, from the receiver module,* at least one of: *a secure displayable version of a rendered form of the requested content,* or a description enabling access to the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content[1], the rendered form of the requested content comprising a form produced in the secure runtime environment by a process of interpreting the requested content in a way that a graphical representation of the requested content can be displayed via a graphical user interface to a user, *the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content comprising a secure displayable graphical representation of at least some insecure requested content,*

as recited in independent claim 1 (emphases added).[2] *See* App. Br. 9–15; Reply Br. 2–6.

The Examiner initially cites Gribble's Figure 5B and paragraph 80 for disclosing the italicized claim limitation. *See* Final Act. 3–4. In response to Appellant's arguments, the Examiner cites Gribble's paragraphs 78 and 80. *See* Ans. 7–8. We have examined the cited Gribble's portions, and they do not discuss

---

[1] The Examiner does not map the alternative claim element "or a description enabling access to the secure displayable version of the rendered form of the requested content." *See* Final Act. 4.

[2] Appellant raises additional arguments with respect to a non-existing rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *See* App. Br. 16–17. Because the Examiner has not rejected any claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, we do not reach the additional arguments.

> *receiving, from the receiver module . . . a secure displayable*
> *version of a rendered form of the requested content, . . . the*
> rendered form of the requested content comprising a form
> produced in the secure runtime environment by a process of
> interpreting the requested content in a way that a graphical
> representation of the requested content can be displayed via a
> graphical user interface to a user, *the secure displayable version*
> *of the rendered form of the requested content comprising a*
> *secure displayable graphical representation of at least some*
> *insecure requested content,*

as required by claim 1 (emphases added). *See* App. Br. 9–15; Reply Br. 2–6.
Absent further explanation from the Examiner, we do not see how the cited
Gribble portions disclose the disputed claim limitation.

Because the Examiner fails to provide sufficient evidence or
explanation to support the anticipation rejection, we are constrained by the
record to reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 1.

Each of independent claim 9, 14, and 15 recites a claim limitation that
is substantively similar to the disputed limitation of claim 1. *See* claims 9,
14, and 15. Therefore, for similar reasons, we reverse the Examiner's
rejection of independent claim 9, 14, and 15.

We also reverse the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 2–8 and
10–13, which depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively.

DECISION

We reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1–15.

REVERSED